

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter from claim 5, indicated to be allowable, without intervening limitations.


The intervening limitation of claim 2 obviously was not sufficient in the Examiner's opinion to merit patentability. Since the use of a controller was not patentable, sending the signal to the controller would not, in the Examiner's opinion, apparently be patentable either. Moreover, the Examiner is apparently considering the controller in the cited reference to be both the memory controller and the WEDAC and BEDAC between the memory controller and the memory. Under the Examiner's claim construction, even something between the memory controller and the memory can be considered part of the controller. Therefore, merely have a controller or merely having the error correction devices outside the memory and between the memory and the controller would not be sufficient to distinguish the reference.

Claim 1, as amended, includes the limitation that is responsible for the patentability of the claim. Similar amendments are made to the other independent claims.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 19, 2009



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation